

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN**

TONY FORE,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No. 09-C-242

LAKESIDE BUSES OF WISCONSIN, INC.,

Defendant.

ORDER STRIKING DOCUMENTS

On March 3, 2009, Tony Fore (“Fore”), proceeding pro se, filed a complaint against Lakeside Buses of Wisconsin, Inc. (“Lakeside”), his former employer, alleging that he was terminated from his employment because of his race, in violation of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. § 2000e et. seq. Accompanying his complaint was a motion to proceed in forma pauperis, (Docket No. 2), and a motion for the appointment of counsel, (Docket No. 3).

On March 5, 2009, this court granted Fore’s motion to proceed in forma pauperis and denied without prejudice Fore’s request for the appointment of counsel. (Docket No. 4.) In the court’s order denying Fore’s request for appointed counsel without prejudice, the court stated that it would reconsider Fore’s request if after making an effort to obtain counsel, he was unsuccessful. On April 9, 2009, Fore filed a renewed request for appointed counsel.

On May 7, 2009, the court granted Fore’s request for an attorney and appointed Attorney Jerold V. Fennell to represent Fore. The court entered an amended scheduling order on June 3, 2009, setting June 19, 2009 as the deadline for Fore to submit an amended complaint.

On June 18, 2009, Fore, pro se, filed a handwritten document captioned “Add to Original Complaint,” wherein he provided additional information about his claim. (Docket No. 22.) The defendant filed an answer to this supplement on July 2, 2009. (Docket No. 23.) On July 17, 2009, Fore, again proceeding pro se, filed another handwritten document captioned “Add to Original Complaint.” In this document, Fore states that these documents, as well as the prior supplement, are not intended as amended complaints. Fore again provides additional information about his claim and attached various exhibits.

The court shall not accept “hybrid representation.” A litigant appears in court either by counsel or pro se. In the present case, the court granted Fore’s request for appointed counsel and appointed Attorney Fennel to represent him. In requesting and receiving the appointment of counsel, whom the court notes is very experienced in cases such as Fore’s, Fore gave up the opportunity to represent himself. Accordingly, so long as Fore is represented by counsel, the court shall not accept pleadings submitted by Fore pro se; therefore, Fore’s pro se supplements, **Docket Numbers 22 and 25, are hereby stricken**. If there is information that Fore believes must be presented to the court, Fore shall discuss that matter with his attorney and any filings will be undertaken by counsel.

SO ORDERED.

Dated at Milwaukee, Wisconsin this 22nd day of July 2009.

s/AARON E. GOODSTEIN
U.S. Magistrate Judge